## REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. The amendments made to claim 1 do not alter the scope of the claim, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 1 in view of the Examiner's remarks. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 10, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,708,217 ("Colson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,171 ("Gupta"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Among the limitations of apparatus claim 1 and corresponding method claim 7 is "a plurality of parsers ... wherein the obtained content is parsed by a corresponding parser ... to produce displaying information for displaying an obtained content based on displaying information on the display section wherein the display section displays the obtained content based on the displaying information." As explicitly recited in Applicants' claim, the display section displays the obtained content based on the displaying information. This feature is not shown in The cited references.

In Colson, different data is matched to different content renderers. As shown in Figure 3, depending on the content type, different devices render the content. In other words, as discussed at column 7, line 45 - column 8, line 14, text is processed by a fax machine, images are handled by a display device and the like. Thus, while Colson

7

has the ability to render various content types, the system in Colson is unable to <u>display</u> all of the various content types in a single device.

In an effort to cure the above deficiency in Colson, the Examiner includes Gupta for its teaching of demultiplexer to distribute the appropriate content to appropriate rendering components to render the content. However, Applicants note that there is no claimed demultiplexer. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of a multiplexer fails to cure the deficiency in Colson noted above. Further, the demultiplexer in Gupta merely separates an audio and video stream. The audio content is decoded and sent to an audio renderer where the video content is demultiplexed and sent to a video renderer. However, Gupta also suffers from a deficiency that there are not "a plurality of parsers corresponding to respective ones of the plurality of content types ... wherein the display section <u>displays</u> the obtained content based on the displaying information." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed combination fails to anticipate Applicants explicitly recited claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson in view of Gupta as applied to claim 2 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,088 ("Halahmi") and claims 4, 6, 8-9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colson in view of Gupta and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0212686 ("Chu-Carroll"). Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of the Halahmi or Chu-Carroll reference fails to cure the deficiencies in the combination of Colson and Gupta discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicants have responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

8

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.


Dated:  September 15, 2006                    Respectfully submitted,

                                              By_____
                                              Ian R. Blum
                                                Registration No.: 42,336
                                              DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
                                              1177 Avenue of the Americas
                                              New York, New York  10036-2714
                                              (212) 277-6500
                                              Attorney for Applicants

IRB/mgs